

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/565,268 | 09/19/2006 | Laszlo Koska | 12150-0002 7109 | |
| 22902 CLARK & BR | 7590 11/28/2007 ODY | | EXAMINER | |
| 1090 VERMO | NT AVENUE, NW | HRUSKOCI, PETER A | | |
| SUITE 250 WASHINGTO | N, DC 20005 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1797 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | • | 11/28/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | · | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/565,268 | KOSKA, LASZLO | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Peter A. Hruskoci | 1797 | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication app | | orrespondence address | | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/20, | 6/30, and 9/19/06. | | | | | |
| 2a) <u></u> □ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)🖂 | Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | r election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) | The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority ι | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| dee the attached detailed office action for a list of the defined copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | | |
| • • • | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notic | 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. | | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other: | | | | | | | |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | ·, - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |

10/565,268

Art Unit: 1797

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Romans 1,989,380 in view of Ring et al. 6,824,794. Romans disclose (see pages 1 and 2) a method for treating water and removing slime or biofilm substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Romans by reciting a step for introducing copper ions into the water. Ring et al. disclose (see col. 2 line 15 through col. 4 line 21) that it is known in the art to add copper ions to aid in killing bacteria in water. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Romans by adding copper ions to the water in view of the teachings of Ring et al., to aid in killing bacteria in the water. The specific concentration and time period utilized, would have been an obvious matter of process optimization to one skilled in the art, depending on the specific water treated and results desired, absent a sufficient showing of unexpected results. With regard to claim 9 and 10, it is submitted that Ring et al. as applied above disclose the use of silver and tin ions in combination with copper ions in the treatment of water.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00AM-5:00PM.

10/565,268

Art Unit: 1797

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peter A. Hruskoci Primary Examiner Art Unit 1797

11/24/07